DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 135 FL 015 957

AUTHOR Fox, Frank; And Others
TITLE The Multilingual Preschool Parent Participation Project of the Sacramento City Unified School District. Summary of the Final Evaluation Report.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education Programs; Chinese Americans; Laotians; *Limited English Speaking; *Parent Attitudes; *Parent Participation; *Preschool Education; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Spanish Speaking; Teacher Attitudes; Vietnamese People
IDENTIFIERS Hmong People; *Sacramento City Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes the five year period (1980-1985) of the Sacramento City Unified School District Parent Participation Preschool and Children's Centers. The program provided multilingual education to preschool children and their limited-English-speaking parents. Children were enrolled in existing Head Start and State Preschool programs, and they received extra services. Parents were give home teaching kits for reinforcement of classroom lessons and for dissemination of information about community resources. The first phase of the program served speakers of Chinese, Vietnamese, and Spanish; the second phase added Hmong and Laotian services. Evaluation of the program by parents and teachers was very favorable. Recommendations for continuation of the program include the following: (1) more clearly articulated goals and objectives; (2) a longitudinal evaluation plan; (3) replicability of the model; (4) alternative funding sources from within and outside of the district; and (5) dissemination of program outcomes to a wider audience. Data on the program population, developmental assessment instruments and results, and parents' and teachers' program evaluation results are appended to the evaluation summary. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273135

SUMMARY OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT OF THE MULTILINGUAL PRESCHOOL PARENT PARTICIPATION PROJECT OF THE SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

FRANK FOX, SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE/
SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

MOONYENE LEW, SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

JANE TALBERT, SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ELVIE C. WATTS, SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

APRIL 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frank Fox

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper Presented at The American Educational Research Association annual meeting, San Francisco, California, April 1986

FL 015957

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes the five year period of the Multilingual Project of the Sacramento City Unified School District Parent Participation Preschool and Children's Centers. The project was funded in two distinct cycles: 1) 1980-83; 2) 1983-85.* The first cycle consisted of the start-up phase, implementation, and evaluation using three languages (Chinese, Vietnamese, and Spanish). In the second cycle, replication and extension of the services developed in the first cycle were expanded to service two additional language groups of limited English speaking (LEP) preschool children and their families (Hmong and Laotian). The findings of the annual evaluation conducted over the five years period were most favorable. Teachers and parents voiced strong positive affirmation of the project's main goals. They recognized the importance of these additional education services as provided for their children by the program. Recommendations and implications for the continuance of the project included:

1) more clearly articulated goals and objectives for the project including a sound longitudinal evaluation design.
2) replicability of the model.
3) alternative funding sources from within and outside of the district need to be sought. Services/training to other districts could generate proceeds for the project.
4) dissemination of the positive outcomes of the program be made available to a wider audience.

*This project was funded by Title VII, Chapter VII Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The evaluation was conducted by the Administrative and Evaluation Services of the Sacramento City Unified School District, W. Parsons, Adm. 1619 N Street, Sacramento, California, 95810. The project was administered by Dr. Elvie C. Watts, Director of Parent Participation Preschool and Children's Centers Programs.

OBJECTIVES

This paper summarizes five years of summative and formative evaluation of the federally funded (Title VII) Multilingual Preschool Program. The project was conducted under the auspices of the Sacramento City Unified School District (SCUSD) and was implemented into the district's Parent Participation Preschool Program (PPP) consisting of 27 classrooms, funded by a variety of sources (e.g. state, district and Head Start). The evaluation of the ongoing project was conducted by the Administrative and Evaluation Services offices of the S.C.U.S.D. The purposes of the evaluation were: a) to determine the general and specialized positive effects of the program; b) to examine the project's weaknesses for purposes of redesign for future planning; and c) to comply with the federal mandate linking evaluation and funding.

PURPOSES

The purpose of the project was to provide multilingual education to preschool age children and their parents with limited or no English. Children were enrolled in existing Head Start and State Preschool programs and received extra services. The main goal of the project was to assist these children in the acquisition of basic skills and readiness for kindergarten entrance. The curriculum focused on the cultures and background of these children and their families rather than ethnic grouping alone.

The parent education design provided home teaching kits in order to reinforce classroom lessons for child and parent in the basic skills and also provided information for practical use of community resources such as health clinics, nutrition, consumer education and family counseling.

The curriculum for the program included classroom lessons focusing on expressive receptive language. Approximately 123 children were involved in the initial project. The staff consisted of a bilingual resource teacher and three aides speaking Chinese, Spanish, and Vietnamese as well as English. For the fourth and fifth years of the project, an additional aide speaking Hmong and Laotian was utilized. Staff visited the program sites on a scheduled basis to deliver the predesigned curriculum.

NEED

The Sacramento City Unified School District supervises a total of 48 classes in child growth and development for parents and their three to five year old children. These classes are housed in 37 locations throughout the district in an effort to better service families with preschool aged children who may have limited or no transportation. Twenty seven of these classes are located in areas designated as low income and comprised the identified population of this project. Enrollment is open and includes a multi-ethnic population. During 1979-80 138 children representating nine non-English speaking language groups were identified in 20 of these classes. Before the onset of the project services to these Asian children and support to their parents were non-existent, and limited mainly to Spanish families.

Sound early childhood practice suggests the benefits of early intervention for both child and parents. Strategies to assist the child in the development of concepts and readiness skills appropriate to his/her age are necessary prior to the teaching of a second language.

The ethnic composition of the Sacramento City Unified School District prior to the time of start up is shown in Appendix A.

INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH

The project addressed the needs of children with limited or no English proficiency. The child's native language was used as a means of instruction. The children were instructed in basic skills as taught in a typical preschool classroom by the bilingual teaching assistants of the project. Each classroom was visited for a period of approximately twenty minutes weekly. Free choice activity time or designated language activity time enabled the assistants to instruct the children in large as well as small groups. During the remainder of the week, the regular teaching staff communicated with the student in English. In classrooms where the teaching staff spoke the native language of the child the resource teacher endeavored to provide materials and lessons to the classroom staff for supplementary curriculum.

The preschool children continued to develop social, cognitive, language and psychomotor skills in a systematically scheduled program appropriate for three and four year olds. Activities involving free choice, dramatic play, outdoor play, story time, direct instruction in small groups, and nutrition were all included, in English.

The project also provided culturally relevant materials for use by all of the children in the classroom. Thus, the LES/NES students enriched the Head Start/State preschool classes by sharing their ethnic backgrounds.

Home teaching kits were designed to acquaint parents with current child development information and follow through on the themes presented in the classrooms.

Materials used in the classroom were of an eclectic nature, including: The Peabody Language Development Kit, Language Lotto, Early Childhood Multicultural Curriculum "Sharing Our Diversity", Peabody Early Experience Kit, Nuevas Fronteras, Language Master, Materials for Expressive Syntax Therapy, and others.

Development of materials specifically appropriate for the students served included translation of available early childhood materials. The search for adaptable curriculum, and creating new units especially suitable to meet the pupils' needs was accomplished by extracting thematic and conceptual ideas from these materials. Ideas and themes were selected to provide important, meaningful yet novel experiences for the children.

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

1) A planned curriculum for preschool children and their parents (LES/NES) was designed. The children's first language was utilized. The children were exposed to the English language according to their developmental needs. Each one's cultural heritage was acknowledged and parents were encouraged to serve as resource in the classrooms.
2) A parent participation component was established. The component included instructions on how to participate in the classroom instruction as well as home teaching lessons for parents to practice skills at home. The multilingual preschool teaching staff was provided with background information necessary to implement the instructional program for these children of limited English proficiency.

PERSPECTIVES

Few effective curriculum models exist which facilitate English language acquisition and simultaneous maintenance of the native language. This project has attempted to service five to seven different language speaking populations, using four bilingual paraprofessional staff and one certificated resource teacher. Services were offered in four distinct ways: 1) bilingual instruction was offered both in the target families' native tongue and in English; 2) parent home teaching kits in the native language and classroom teacher kits in English were provided; 3) in-service education for all teaching staff involved with the PPP was provided; and 4) parent education meetings and written communication to the families were provided in the native language and in English.

Since 1967, the year Title VII ESEA legislation was enacted, there has been a dearth of programs made available for bilingual education servicing the early childhood years (children aged 3-8) (Legarreta, 1979).. In 1974, the U.S. Supreme Court, in Lau vs. Nichols, "mandated" appropriate relief for students who do not understand English and are thus effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education Specifically, "appropriate relief" was interpreted to mean "bilingual education" which uses and fosters the child's native tongue, while facilitating his/her acquisition of English (Lau vs. Nichols:1974 #72-652).

This program, whose evaluation results are herein presented in detail, attempted to fill that mandate by servicing five to seven distinct ethnic populations of preschoolers' families via the Sacramento City Unified School District's Parent Participation Preschool program, as described above.

METHODS AND TECHNIQUES

Assessments were scheduled to be conducted on a) the program's effectiveness in servicing the multiethnic families via samplings of attitudinal measures of all participants both the target families and all instructional staff; b) the growth and development of the students, assessed by classroom anecdotal materials, teacher, parent and supervisory classroom observations, and the administration of the Thorpe Developmental Inventory (TDI) which taps into the cognitive, physical, emotional and social areas of development. The latter was administered on a pre/post program basis, to each child. Initial administration was in the native language. (This matter will be discussed more adequately in the conclusion section.); and c) overall success in attainment of the project's initial objectives.

DATA SOURCES

Teachers and parents were administered formal surveys regarding the program's effectiveness. Additionally attitudinal anecdotal information was solicited by the director and supervisory staff. In May, 1981 forty-two teachers were surveyed regarding the program's effects. Parents were additionally asked the same kinds of items in their own native language. Survey and open ended responses were analyzed according to the percentage of responses based on a three-point Likert-type scale ranging from negative, neutral, to positive. Limited English Speaking (LEP) children's progress in the classrooms were monitored by the administrative staff and the pre and post TDI scores, measuring progress in gross motor, fine motor, language and comprehension, self concept and socialization skills. The TDI score is expressed as a cumulative developmental score, compared to the actual age of child in months (e.g. child was 48 months at initial administration overall the child scored at 46 months on the TDI). Each separate area contains individual age related scores, standarized according to the usual concerns regarding reliability and validity (see Appendix B).

Finally, areas of implementation were reviewed and analyzed according to their effectiveness in both summative and formative evaluations of these bilingual activities. The activities were monitored and adjusted via the use of project documentation, (i.e., workshops' minutes, staff reports, and ongoing systematic observation of instruction with the children, parents and staff, via the use of daily anecdotal reports and frequent feedback sessions). Most of the data was not of a sufficient quantitative nature to allow a statistical analysis to be conducted on the project. Weaknesses in evaluation design contributed to these shortcomings. These weaknesses are discussed in the conclusions section.

RESULTS

Initial parent evaluations were broken down according to ethnic groups served. This proved to be somewhat difficult to evaluate and subsequently resulted in simple reporting of the percentage of responses to the attitudinal measure, by item. The final three years of the project's parent evaluations showed that 72% of the parents who responded to the survey favored the project very positively (See Appendix C).

The TDI Pretests in 1980-81 were administered initially in native languages. Post tests were done in English (See Appendix D). Questions concerning validility and reliability and over all utility of the measure as an instrument assessing achievement were raised. The measure does provide a developmental readiness score in terms of months of age. The TDI pre and post measures (1981-82) were subsequently conducted in English. Since the measure was not usable as a predictor of school achievement, its subsequent use as a pre/post measure was deleted from this evaluation report. Questions also arose about the cultural transferability of the TDI. (See the conclusion section below). However, 88% of the students had a gain on the post test scores in at least three of the five areas tested, and 80% had gained on all five parts of the TDI.

Results of the responses from classroom teacher checklists, (See Appendix E) showed favorable findings far in excess of negative responses to the project. This measure was switched to the School Staff Evaluation of Bilingual Project in the 1983-84 (See Appendix F) which also reported highly favorable response to the program's effectiveness.

CONCLUSIONS/POINTS OF VIEW

The findings of the data sources reported identified many problematic areas that need to be addressed in the future. However, the project was highly effective overall in enabling children and their families to acquire English in the six to nine month period of the preschool program. The parent involvement and home teaching kits provided in the native language proved difficult to manage and assess effectively. Isolating precisely which features were more influential than others was never even considered on a priori basis. The human personal element is often not readily subjected to quantitative analysis. The project had its initial goals. As it continued other problems arose and new roles were created. These problems are summarized below.

Evaluation and Assessment.
The (TDI) was used to assess the students' ability to speak English and their readiness skills for kindergarten. Questions as to the cultural validity and reliability of this norm-referenced assessment tool and the administration of this tool in the native language of the children were not pre-determined. Another problem was the age range of the children. Many teachers felt multi-testing of young children to be traumatic. The original design of the project failed to specify explicit methods of data collection, analyses, and organization. No systematic preparation to handle data collected by the assessments was available. In the initial year of the project the limited data available on the (TDI) highlighted some of these cultural and quantitative problems. For example, no actual increase in scores, only indications of specific growth in receptive and expressive language, gross/fine motor and self-help were noted. Although the TDI was fully translated into the various native languages of the children, it needs to be restandardized for the population currently being served. A systematic procedure to collect the data employing correlation to the children's needs and the goals/objectives of the program would assistin future program implementation. The measure itself might not be appropriate to satisfy these needs.

Recommendations made in the above mentioned areas are all predicated on the fact that a sound evaluation design, specified a priori, is a necessary factor to be included to assess program outcomes. Sound evaluation design, especially if theory based, helps to sharpen the focus of a project of this nature. The project's goals and objectives need to be operationalized as precisely as possible (Hutchinson and Benedict, 1970). A model to guide the evaluation of any such report of this nature is strongly recommended. Robert Stake's (See Appendix G) evaluative model holds many virtues as a guiding theoretical construct. Stake's model is a common sense, thorough and non-threatening approach to the problems of program evaluation (Stake, 1967; Stake and Denny, 1969).

A final emphasis is the inclusion of a sophisticated longitudinal design. The future project needs to have new measurement tools specified. A cognitive non-verbal measure such as the Raven's matrices or a tool of that nature is worth investigating in more detail. Also systematic classroom observation data collection (with verifiable interrata reliability) would increase the authenticity of the project's data documentation.

Hiring and Recruiting of Teaching Assistants.
Recruiting of competent native language-English speakers was another difficulty encountered in the project. Teaching assistants are required to pass a G.E.D. examination to be considered for a position in the preschool. Most individuals proficient in English and a native language were more desirous of jobs with higher salaries, fringe benefits, and extended working hours. In addition, willing candidates had difficulty passing the bilingual oral and written examination in comprehension, reading and writing. Another feature hindering the hiring of competent bilingual individuals was their English language educational training. Their needs in the areas of oral delivery, articulation, questioning skills and educational psychology were noted. Pre-service and continuous in-service workshops in child development would be most helpful in future projects.

Classroom Instruction and Documentation of the Lessons.
Lesson plans were written weekly by the resource teacher. The themes for lessons were chosen to introduce new concepts, teach specific language patterns, explore new ideas, and preview holidays and other information unfamiliar to the students and their families. After each classroom visitation documentation of students' progress was made on individual student files. Small groups of six to eight children in a class presented a simplistic task. However, larger groups of students created a monumental one. Due to the large geographic area served, the assistants were prevented from making more frequent visitations to classrooms. The hiring of additional personnel might help distribute the workload and enable weekly or biweekly lessons and home visits.

Parent Education Component.
Since parent education was an integral part of the project, a prepared home teaching kit was translated into the various native languages. Parent commitment included weekly parent participation in the classroom and attendance at monthly parent education meetings. The parents involved in the project also received a series of five to seven home teaching lessons. Written instructions in English and or the native language accompanied each lesson discussing various ways of working with children outside the class environment. The parents' signature indicated participation in the reading of the lessons. Illiterate parents in English and their native language were presented prepared taped cassettes of the lessons at school on their parent participation day. While there is a significant amount of exposure there is no possibility of assessing the success or failure of such a procedure in the transferring of teaching strategies to the parents. All of the above was limited due to time constraints on the staff. A recommendation would be that additional funding needs to be earmarked for more staff time to make home visits, demonstrate and model these lessons while communicating directly with parents.

Home Visitations.
Two home visitations to each students' home are required of instructors in Head Start/State programs. Often bilingual teaching assistants served as interpreters for these communications. The assistants were trained in child development strategies enabling them to explain varying degrees of educational information pertinent to the child's progress to parents. These assistants utilized the assessment tool (TDI) to offer in-depth explanations of the significance of the child's responses. The bilingual staff accompanied classroom staff to individual homes to translate to the teacher and the parents on the student's progress. Other social services and physical/dental requirements necessitated translation and interpretation by the staff. Hiring additional personnel to assist in these services as well as interpreters for parent meetings would insure more complete communication between school and home.

Interpreting/Translation Services.
The influx of many language groups to the preschool increased the need for services to these newly arrived families and their children. An atmosphere of mutual understanding through use of the native language of these individuals increased trust among people. At the onset of the project, translations into native languages were limited to lessons for the children and assessment tools (TDI). As the project continued, other needs arose regarding the use of translations. These services were needed for parent meetings, telephone calls, health forms, and social service forms to be completed. All of these were required in the regular program. None of these services were specifically enumerated in the original project's proposal. Any future project must provide funding for time and personnel to meet these daily program needs.

Staff Training.
A pre-service and six in-service training sessions were provided for the entire preschool staff by the resource teacher each year. This training included an orientation to the techniques and materials of classroom visitations. An explanation of the teaching assistants' responsibilities in the classroom and to the project was also presented. In addition, the goals and objectives of the project were defined. The training provided current research data, strategies for working with the children and families served, feedback sessions, questions and answers sessions, and hands on workshops to prepare materials for supplementary classroom curricula. Many favorable evaluations were received from the preschool teaching staff. Suggestions for the continuance of the project were numerous. Teachers reported observations of progress by students with the strategies and predesigned lessons.

In conclusion, the project was well received and provided special attention to the families and students it served. The preschool staff felt the project assisted in the teaching process for all of the families involved. The multicultural model respected each group of people represented in individual classrooms of the school district and further enhanced the exchange of culture among people. Finally, it should be recognized that the project attempted to be all things to all people. It was necessary for the staff to do more than the initial goals intended. These needs must be readdressed in any future proposal for refunding of the project.

Appendix A

2.2 ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE STUDENT POPULATION OF THE DISTRICT, FALL 1978, FALL 1979

School Year	Ethnic Composition Including Preschools										
	American Indian or Alaskan Native		Asian or Pacific Islander		Not of Hispanic Origin				Hispanic		Total
					Black		White				
	Enrollment	%	Enrollment	%	Enrollment	%	Enrollment	%	Enrollment	%	
1979-80	540	1.4	4545	11.5	8706	22.1	18869	47.8	6779	17.2	39,439
1978-79	600	1.5	4471	10.9	8747	21.4	20129	49.2	6963	17.0	40,910

ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE STUDENT POPULATION OF THE INVOLVED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, FALL 1979

Schools	Ethnic Composition Including Preschools										
	American Indian or Alaskan Native		Asian or Pacific Islander		Not of Hispanic Origin				Hispanic		Total
					Black		White				
	Enrollment	%	Enrollment	%	Enrollment	%	Enrollment	%	Enrollment	%	
Elder Creek	2	.5	109	27.4	154	38.8	57	14.4	75	18.9	397
Ethel Phillips	3	.8	4	1.1	47	13.4	109	31.1	188	53.6	351
Fremont	1	5.0	9	45.0	2	10.0	4	20.0	4	20.0	20
Fruit Ridge	4	1.0	14	3.4	151	36.7	130	31.5	113	27.4	412
Jedediah Smith/ New Helvetia	16	4.0	76	18.7	98	24.1	74	18.2	142	35.0	406
Maple	16	9.0	11	6.2	22	12.4	51	28.8	77	43.6	177
Pacific	13	3.6	11	3.1	58	16.2	151	42.2	125	34.9	358
Washington	7	2.2	18	5.7	21	6.6	109	34.4	162	51.1	317
William Land	8	1.9	164	39.2	43	10.3	87	20.8	116	27.8	418
TOTALS	70		416		596		772		1002		2,f

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B

THORPE DEVELOPMENTAL INVENTORY
COVER SHEET AND PROGRESS RECORD
©1973 Helene S. Thorpe, M.D.
©1977 Sandra L. Pickens

Name: _____
Age: ____ Sex: ____

Date pre: ____ Date post: ____

1st Language _____

Program: _____
Enrolled dates: _____
Previous preschool: _____

Blank = age appropriate
S = strength

SKILL SUMMARY

X = need (50%)
* = lag (90%)

R = refused

GROSS MOTOR	SELF IDENTITY	COMPREHENSION - EXPRESSION	FINE MOTOR	SELF CARE
Walk - forward	Name (full)	Recognize Colors	Dominance	Button
Walk - backward	Sex	Name Colors	Level of Drawing	Snap
Walk - forward with balance - right	Problem solves BASIC NEEDS	Prepositions	Knows Shapes	Zip
Balance - left	Traffic Safety	Body Parts	Eye-hand control	Buckle
Hop - right	Care of Toy	Left/Right	Self	Lace
Hop - left	Sentences	Number Concepts	Incomplete Man	Tie
Gallop		Left to Right Progression		
Follow Directions		Memory Span		
		Vocabulary		
		Pronunciation		
		Opposites		
		Descriptions		

Months-of-Age Profile
Skill Graph

Key: Solid lines are age, skill level of pre
Broken lines are age, skill level of post.

MO.	GM	SI	CE	FM	PS
72					
66					
60					
54					
48					
42					
36					

Age pre: ____ yrs. ____ mos.

Age post: ____ yrs. ____ mos.

SCORES

		GM	SI	CE	FM	PS
PRE	Raw					
	Scale					
POST	Raw					
	Scale					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE THORPE DEVELOPMENTAL INVENTORY, Revised Edition 1976

Copyright © Helene S. Thorpe, M.D., 1973, UC Davis

Name _____ boy or girl

DATE	YEAR	MONTH
Inventory done		
Birthdate		
Actual Age		

Center _____

How long in program this yr. _____

Examiner _____ 1st or retest

Norms Years
50% ■ 90%

GROSS MOTOR ABILITIES

	SPOKEN PASS	Example Pass	Not Pass	Refuse	History
1. Walk Forward					
2. Walk backwards					
3. Forward heel-toe					
4. Backward heel-toe					
5. Balance right foot 10 sec.					
Other one left foot 10 sec.					
6. Hop right foot					
left foot					
7. Skip alternating feet					

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

	SPOKEN PASS	Not Pass	Refuse	History
A. **Self Identity** and Sentence Use				
What is your whole name?				
a) are you a boy or a girl?				
b) What do you do when you are hungry?				
b) you are sleepy?				
c) you are cold?				
d) you want to cross the big street and many cars are coming?				
e) you lose a toy?				

3 4 5 6

15

D4506 (3/77)

COMMENTS

Norms Years
50% ■ 90%

B. Comprehension and Expression

	SPOKEN PASS	Not Pass	Refuse	History
1. Give me the ones that are red				
yellow				
blue				
green				
2. What color is this one? red				
yellow				
blue				
green				
3. Put block *under the chair*				
behind				
in front of				
on				
4. Show me your eyes, ears,				
nose, mouth, legs				
5. Raise right hand				
Point to your left eye				
Touch your left ear				
Touch your right leg				
6. How many are here? four				
l. → r. seven				
r. → l. two				
7. Please say numbers after me nine six				
two eight three				
five seven four one				
8. Name pictures / Pronunciation				
(circle errors) (circle errors)				

man wagon knife
hat house ring
balloon pig boy
dog cup fish bed
car chair girl
shoes telephone

3. m,n,p,h,w
4. b,k,g,f
5. y,ng,d
6. l,r,t,sh,ch

9. What are these? (block(s)) (shoes)				

3 4 5 6

16

Copyright © by Helene S. Thorpe, M.D.–UC Davis 1973-4

Copyright © by Helene S. Thorpe, M.D.–UC Davis 1973-4

COMMENTS

THE THORPE DEVELOPMENTAL INVENTORY

© Helene S. Thorpe, M.D., 1973

Child's name _____

2	3	4	5	6	10	Can you finish these	Spoken Pass	Not Pass	Refuse	History
	■	■				a) A mommy is a woman, a daddy is a (man)				
						b) A horse is big. A mouse is (little)				
						c) I sit on a chair. I sleep in a (bed)				
						d) I eat from a plate, I drink from a (cup)				
						e) Soup is hot, ice cream is (cold)				
						f) A rock is hard, a pillow is (soft)				
						11. What is this? What is it used for?				
■	■					Objects show a ball				
						show a spoon				
						show a key				
■						Pictures of a cake				
						of a coat				
■	■					Spoken a banana				
■	■					a house				
■						a shoe				
	■	■				a curtain				
			■	■		a desk				

FINE MOTOR SKILLS (Circle one)

3	4	5	6	1. Spontaneous drawing:	Spoken Pass	Examples Pass	Not Pass	Refuse	History
				a. right hand left both					
				b. One several colors					
				c. scribble design recognizable					
■	■			2. a) Make a circle					
	■	■		b) Make a cross (X or +)					
		■	■	c) Make a box or square					

3. Draw a child

Parts Added	
Head	■
Eyes	
Arms	
Legs	
Hair	
Mouth	
Nose	
Ears	
Body	
Clothes	
Fingers	
Toes	
Pupils	
Eyebrows	
Neck	
Navel	
Profile	
Other	

4. Incomplete man

PERSONAL SOCIAL OBSERVATION (Self Care)

3	4	5	6		Spoken Pass	Not pass	Refuse	History
■	■			1. Open and close snappers				
■				2. Button and unbutton 1"				
■	■			3. Button and unbutton ½"				
■				4. Zip up and down				
	■	■		5. Open and close belt buckle				
		■	■	6. Lace shoe				
			■	7. Tie shoe laces bows				
■				8. Drink from a cup (without spilling)				

NORMS	
Age 3	–2 parts
3½	–3 parts
4	–4 parts
4½	–5 parts
5	–6 parts
5½	–7 parts

COMMENTS

Detail Health or Educational plans here:

Copyright © by Helene S. Thorpe, M.D. – UC Davis 1973–4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

D4508 (3/77)

TDI PARENT FORM

Child's name:_____ This is a ___one___two parent family.
Sex:_____ Age:_____ Completed by:_____

1. How does your child show you that he/she is happy?
   hugs you___
   sings___
   shouts with joy___
   smiles___
   other_____

2. How does your child show you that he/she is unhappy or upset ?
   comes to be comforted___
   cries or pouts___
   hits, kicks or bites___
   swears or shouts___
   goes quietly to his room___
   other_____

3. Which of these is most important, to you, for your child to do each day?
   stay clean, be quiet___
   do chores at home___
   share toys with others___
   learn new skills at school___
   other_____

4. If your child is trying to do something new do you help whether or not he/she asks for help___
   only if he/she asks for it___
   by first suggesting new ways he/she should try before helping___
   other_____

5. How often does someone in the family read stories with your child?
   almost every day___
   several times a week ___
   not often___
   other_____

6. Do you have a television set that works?No___Yes___
   Check which programs your child watches every day:
   ___ cartoons
   ___ educational TV
   ___ cowboy movies
   ___ Sesame Street
   ___ adventure movies
   ___ sports
   ___ other

7. Which meals does the whole family eat together?
   breakfast ___
   noon meal ___
   evening meal___
   none ___
   other_____

8. At meal times does he/she feed him/her self mostly with his/her
   fingers ___
   spoon___
   fork and spoon___
   other _____

9. If you serve a new food do you
   tell your child he/she must eat it___
   mix it with food he/she likes___
   offer him/her candy if he/she eats it ___
   never offer anything new or different ___
   other_____

10. What does your child do with new foods?
    eat some if it___
    try it only if others are eating it___
    refuse to try it, cry___
    throw it, spit it, vomit it___
    other_____

11. Is your child allergic to any foods? (Circle)
    wheat milk citrus
    eggs other:_____

12. Are there any foods your child should not eat at school for religious or other reasons?___yes___no What?

13. Does your child eat dirt, paint, or plaster?
    ___no___ yes

14. What does your child do that pleases you the most?
    stays clean___
    does his/her chores___
    cares for younger children___
    obeys family rules___
    learns new skills at play or school ___
    other_____

15. How do you let your child know that you are pleased?
    tell him/her___
    hug or kiss him/her___
    give him/her money ___
    give him/her privileges___
    other_____

16. What does your child do that upsets you the most?
    gets dirty or soils his/her clothes___
    loses or breaks toys___
    takes toys from others___
    hits or fights___
    runs in the street___
    does no chores___
    other_____

17. Has your child begun to
    share toys?___no___yes
    play with other children?
    ___no___yes

18. What do you usually do when you are upset with your child?
    tell him/her to stop___
    take him/her from activity___
    explain what is wrong___
    shout at him/her___
    spank, slap or hit him/her___
    send him/her to his room___
    make him/her stand in corner or kneel___
    tell him/her that Daddy will punish him/her later that day___
    other_____

19. Do both parents agree on rules
    most of the time___
    some of the time___
    rarely___

20. What things do you disagree on?
    _____
    _____

21. When you come to school with your child, does he/she leave you to play with toys___
    or other children___
    want you to stay with him/her___
    cry when you try to leave___

22. Does he/she have any fears
    of the dark___
    of animals___
    of noises___

23. What concerns do you have that you want help solving?

_____
_____

Which of these happened during the last 12 months?
___New baby at home
___Adoption
___Hospitalization
___Death
___Change-Parent's job
___Loss-Parents job
___Marital Separation
___Divorce
___Remarriage
___Serious Illness-Parent
___Death Parent
___Death-Close Relative
___Jail Sentence
___Mother begins work
___Other (specify)_____

Details to above checked answers

Appendix C

Summary Table of Parent Evaluations of the Program 1983-86
(All Ethnic Groups Included)

	Very Much		Some		Very Little		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
1) Providing assistance to my child in learning English	415	/.76	114	/.22	15	/.03	544
2) Providing assistance to me as a parent in helping my child develop basic readiness skills	377	/.71	135	/.26	17	/.03	529
3) Providing me with information regarding my childs progress at school in the native language	363	/.70	124	/.24	33	/.06	520
4) Providing me with information in my language in health and nutrition	350	/.69	132	/.26	25	/.05	507
TOTALS	1505	/.72	505	/.24	90	/.04	2100

Appendix D

Children's Development

The Thorpe Inventory of the functional areas of gross motor, self-identity, comprehension, fine motor, and self-care is used to give an overall measurement of child development. This inventory was given to and recorded for all the children with the results being tabulated by ethnic group. The program expectation was that in May, near the end of the school year, 50% of the youngsters would be functioning at or above their age level in three out of five of the aforementioned areas. Both the Chinese and Spanish groups easily exceeded this expectation. However, the Vietnamese children, for the first year, were unable to come up to this level. Results in May of 1983 appeared similar to those obtained in the first two years. Table 2 shows the 1982-83 measurement of each ehtnic group in the five areas and Table 3 shows the overall percent of achievement of all the students in each category over the past three years.

TABLE 2
Thorpe Inventory Measure of Development By Ethnic Group, 1982-83

Number of Students by Ethnic Group	At or Above Age Level in at Least 3 areas	Gross Motor	Self-Identity	Comprehension	Fine Motor	Self-Care
Chinese = 43	75%	77%	31%	24%	98%	100%
Spanish = 70	68%	66%	68%	62%	72%	79%
Vietnamese = 20	30%	30%	25%	25%	45%	50%

TABLE 3
Thorpe Inventory Measure of Development, 1981-1983

	Number of Students	At/Above Age Level in Three Or More Areas	Gross Motor	Self-Identity	Comprehension	Fine Motor	Self-Care
1980-81	60	68%	67%	48%	53%	78%	85%
1981-82	101	89%	83%	65%	80%	90%	92%
1982-83	133	64%	64%	49%	49%	76%	82%

Appendix E

TABLE 2

RESPONSES FROM CLASSROOM TEACHER CHECKLIST
EVALUATION OF PRESCHOOL BILINGUAL PROGRAM (1980-81)

Questions/Statements	Responses (N = 41)			
	Yes/Very	Somewhat	No/Not Much	No Responses
1. During the school year, have you received any inservice training or assistance from the Title VII bilingual staff regarding the understanding and the methods of teaching students with a limited English speaking background or the use of the bilingual materials for home teaching?	34 (83%)[1]	N/A	7	--
If your answer is "Yes", what kind(s)?				
– Inservice sessions or workshops	25 (74%)[2]	N/A	N/A	N/A
– Informal assistance (consultation or explanation, etc.)	27 (79%)			
Is the service helpful to you in your working with the LES students?	25 (74%)	8	1	--
2. During last year (1979-80) did you have students with a limited English speaking background in your class?	26 (63%)	N/A	6	9
If your answer is "Yes", according to your experience, is there any difference between this year and last in the level of participation in learning activities among the LES students in your class?				
More participation this year	21 (81%)[2]	N/A	N/A	1
Same between two years	4 (15%)			
Less participation this year	-- --			
3. Any suggestions for program improvement? (Listed at the right are the ones mentioned at least two times.)	a. The project staff has done well/they were very helpful/ continue the good work/hope that more regular program staff will participate (N = 6) b. Need more workshops for regular program staff. (N = 4) c. To start at the beginning of school and to coordinate more closely with activities of regular programs. (N = 2) d. To help home visiting/to continue weekly contact with students. (N = 2)			

[1]Based on total number of teachers who completed the checklist.
[2]Based on the number of "yes" responses to the question. (For question 1, the base is 34; for question 2, the base is 26.)

Appendix F

TABLE 5
School Staff Evaluation of Bilingual Project

Please help us evaluate the effectiveness of the bilingual project during the three years of operation by checking your response to each of the following items:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The biligual program has assisted the staff to help students in the acquisition of preschool skills and concepts.	42	11	--	--
2. The bilingual program has assisted the staff to help students in their development and use of the English language.	42	11	--	--
3. The bilingual program has assisted the staff to usilize the child's cultural heritage as a basis for security, acceptance, interpreting, and making meaningful his/her new environment.	42	11	--	--
4. The bilingual program has assisted the staff to involve limited English speaking parents in classroom participation and home teaching activities.	33	20	--	--
5. The bilingual program has provided the staff with the knowledge and techniques to develop their competency in the teaching of the non-limited-English speaking students and in communication with their parents.	39	14	--	--

RATIONALE:

	ANTECEDENTS	TRANSACTIONS	OUTCOMES
INTENTS			
OBSERVED ACTUALITIES			

Robert Stake's Evaluative Model

References

Hutchinson, T.E. and Benedict, L.G., The operationalism of fuzzy concepts. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts, September 1970.

Legarretta D. An investigation of the use of non-use of formal (ESL) training on the acquisition of English by Spanish speaking kindergarten children in traditional and bilingual classrooms, Tesol Quarterly, Vol. 13 #4, Dec. 1979.

Stake, Robert. The Countenance of Educational Evaluation. Teacher's College Record, Vol. 68 (1967), pp. 523-540.

Stake, Robert and Terry Denny. Needed concepts and techniques for utilizing more fully the potential of evaluation, in Educational Evaluation: New Roles, New Means, NSSE Yearbook, Part II, 1969 pp. 370-390.